

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed November 29, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9-10 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9-10 are pending for examination with claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 being independent. The application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,363,077 B1 (Wong) in view of Amadon et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,020,147 B1 (Amadon).

Applicants respectfully disagree with these rejections for the reasons set forth below. The Applicants maintain the same arguments with respect to Wong as presented in the previous response to the Office Action mailed June 13, 2006.

In the Office Action at page 3 and 6, the Examiner states that with respect to claims 1 and 5, Wong does not “disclose explicitly dynamically adjustable weighting”. The Examiner further states Amadon discloses “explicitly the limitation of dynamically adjustable weighting.” With respect to claims 3 and 7, the Examiner states in the Office Action that Wong does not “disclose explicitly the table routes being dynamically adjustable.” The Examiner further states that Amadon discloses “explicitly the limitation of the table routes being dynamically adjustable.”

Applicants’ application is a continuation of U.S. Application No. 09/073,842, filed May 6, 1998, which claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/082,923, filed April 24, 1998. Amadon has a filing date of November 13, 2001, which is more than 3 years later than this application having a priority date of April 24, 1998 of the U.S. Provisional Application (60/082,923) and the U.S. Application filed May 6, 1998 (09/073,842). Therefore, Amadon is an improper prior art reference.


Thus, claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 patentably distinguish over the prior art of record. Dependent claims 9 and 10 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 5 and therefore include all of the limitations of independent claim 5. Consequently, dependent claims 9 and 10 are allowable for at least the same reasons as argued above with respect to claims 1, 3, 5, and 7. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS,  
P.C.

By   
James M. Smith  
Registration No. 28,043  
Telephone: (978) 341-0036  
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 2/13/7